



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10 056,352	01/24/2002	Gregory Mathus	5043CON	8045

7590 08/12/2003

Samuels, Gauthier & Stevens, LLP
225 Franklin Street, Suite 3300
Boston, MA 02110

EXAMINER

KOYAMA, KUMIKO C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2876

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/056,352

Applicant(s)

MATHUS ET AL.

Examiner

Kumiko C. Koyama

Art Unit

2876

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kumiko C. Koyama.

(3) Mr. Mauris Gauthier.

(2) Michael G. Lee.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 05 August 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 22.


Identification of prior art discussed: Wijnschenk et al (US 6,270,728).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner's supervisor reviewed the proposed claims and the prior art references. The examiner's supervisor returned a phone call to Mr. Gauthier explaining that the prior art still reads on the proposed claims and requested a submission of a response to the non-final office action. A copy of the proposed amendment is attached to this interview summary.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

SAMUELS, GAUTHIER & STEVENS LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
PATENTS TRADEMARKS AND COPYRIGHTS

225 FRANKLIN STREET, SUITE 3300
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02110

TELEPHONE (617) 429-9180
WRITER'S EXT.: 123

FAX (617) 426-2275
Email: rlstevens@sgslaw.com

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

TO: United States Patent & Trademark Office **FROM:** Richard L. Stevens, Jr.

ATTN: Examiner Kumiko C. Koyama

FAX NO.: 703-746-9208

DATE: July 22, 2003

RE: U.S. Appln. Ser. No. 10/056,352
TEST TUBE WITH DATA MATRIX CODE MARKINGS
Our File: 5043 (CON)

NO. OF PAGES TO FOLLOW: 3

REMARKS:

Dear Examiner Koyama:

As discussed, proposed claim amendments follow.

If you need anything further, please let me know.

Very truly yours,



Richard L. Stevens, Jr.

The documents transmitted by this facsimile are intended for the use of the individual or the entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of the message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this document to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original facsimile to us at the above address via the Postal Service. Thank you.

U.S. Pat. Appln. Ser. No. 10/056,352
Our File No. 5043(CON)

PROPOSED CLAIM AMENDMENTS

1 22. (Amended) A test tube, comprising:
2 a tube body of unitary construction comprising an enclosed sidewall and an integral
3 bottom that together define a tubular container having an open top, wherein said bottom has an
4 exterior surface upon which an opaque layer is directly applied as a coating, said opaque coating
5 having machine readable data is encoded therein ~~within an opaque coating deposited onto said~~
6 ~~exterior surface~~ to uniquely identify said test tube.

1 23. (Original) The test tube of claim 22, wherein said opaque coating comprises: a first
2 layer of light colored opaque material deposited onto said exterior surface; and a second layer of
3 dark colored opaque material deposited onto said first layer, with select portions of said second
layer having been removed to expose said machine readable data.

1 24. (Original) The test tube of claim 22 wherein said machine readable data is encoded
2 by exposing said coating to a coherent light source.

1 25. (Original) The test tube of claim 23 wherein said machine readable data is encoded
2 by removing selected portions of said second layer to expose underlying portions of said first
3 layer.

1 26. (Original) The test tube of claim 25 wherein the selected portions of said second
2 layer are removed by exposure to a coherent light source.

1 27. (Original) The test tube of claim 23 wherein said first layer is white and said second
2 layer is black.

U.S. Pat. Appl. Ser. No. 10/056,352
Our File No. 5043(CON)

1 28. (Original) The test tube of claims 23 or 27 wherein said first and second layers
2 comprise metal foils.

3 29. (Amended) A method of manufacturing a test tube, comprising the steps of:
4 providing a tube body of unitary construction comprising an enclosed sidewall with an open top
5 and an integral bottom with an exterior surface;
6 applying an opaque coating directly to said exterior surface; and
7 encoding machine readable data within said opaque coating.

1 30. (Original) The method of claim 29 wherein the application of said opaque coating
2 comprises the steps of:

- 3 a) depositing a first layer of opaque material onto said exterior surface;
4 b) depositing a second layer of opaque material onto said first layer, wherein said
5 first and second layers are of contrasting colors.

1 31. (Original) The method of claim 30 wherein said first and second layers comprises
2 metal foils deposited by hot stamping.

1 32. (Original) The method of claim 29 wherein said machine readable data is encoded
2 by exposing selected portions of said opaque coating to a coherent light source.

1 33. (Original) The test tube of claim 24 wherein said opaque coating undergoes a
2 change in color when exposed to said coherent light source.

1 34. (Original) The test tube of claim 33 wherein said opaque coating includes a light
2 sensitive pigment that undergoes said change in color.

U.S. Pat. Apph. Ser. No. 10/056,352
Our File No. 5043(CON)

1 35. (Original) The method of claim 32 wherein said opaque coating undergoes a change
2 in color when exposed to said coherent light source.

1 36. (Original) The method of claim 35 wherein said change in color is effected by
2 altering the color of a light sensitive pigment included in said opaque coating.